Case 3:13-cr-00044-CRB Document 16 Filed 01/24/13 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR	13-0044CK	B
Plaintiff, v.)))		ORDER EXCLUDIN SPEEDY TRIAL ACT	
Tony Befford, Defendant.)))	,		
For the reasons stated by the parties on the Speedy Trial Act from, by the continuance outweigh the best into 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this first	erest of the public	2, 2013 and the defenda	uit iii a speedy titai. De	of justice served ee 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continu See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(ance would be lik (7)(B)(i).	ely to result in a	miscarriage of justice.	
The case is so unusual or defendants, the na or law, that it is unreasor itself within the time lim	ture of the prosect	ution, ort equate preparation	ne existence of novel to on for pretrial proceeding	ngs or the trial
Failure to grant a continutating into account the e	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
Failure to grant a continu counsel's other schedule See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)	d case commitmen	asonably deny the nts, taking into a	e defendant continuity count the exercise of	of counsel, given due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuencessary for effective p See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)	reparation, taking	asonably deny the into account the	e defendant the reason exercise of due diliger	able time nce.
IT IS SO ORDERED.				
DATED: 27 2		LAUREL BE United States	EELER S Magistrate Judge	
STIPULATED: Attorney for P	efendant	Assistant Un	ited States Attorney	
Attorney for L	-CICIDAIN	1 Eddidwiii Oli		